

A YARDSTICK TO MEASURE THE MAN WHO WANTS YOUR VOTE

By JOHN STUART



HAVE YOU EVER HEARD a public office-seeker issue a clarion call for bigger waste and greater inefficiency in government? Or for more and higher taxes? If you have, that would indeed be the day.

Unhappily for the consumer taxpayer (which means all of us who are not in jail or on the town) too many candidates are campaigning for bad and expensive government, but they keep this carefully concealed behind a barrage of fair words and flowery phrases. When the gentleman running for Congressman or United States Senator promises his constituents that, if elected, he will get them a bright, new post office or a perfectly lovely irrigation ditch, he is assuring them of a number of things that don't even appear in fine print at the bottom of his press release. Among these unmentioned items is the fact that post offices and irrigation ditches cost money, and that the government's only source of money is taxes, or inflating the currency.

Thus, the consumer taxpayer, in effect, is voting to pay for his own birthday present. Also, every government project means the hiring of more bureaucrats — which, of course, means more patronage to be dispensed by the winning candidate. This, in spite of Civil Service and pious statements, adds more political hacks to the payroll. These gentry in turn merrily contribute to greater waste and inefficiency in government. Again, the consumer taxpayer is hooked.

Now all of this is not to say there aren't many necessary and proper things that government should and must do if we are to have an orderly and decent country in which to live. Nor does it imply that we don't have many conscientious and competent government employees. Good schools, good roads, fire and police protection, national defense, conservation and soil improvement projects beyond the capacity of the individual farmer to implement are among the many, many things which our complex Twentieth Century world makes it essential for government to functionalize. Our grandfather could hitch up the team and draw dirt to fill in the ruts along the road abutting his farm; today six-lane concrete highways aren't being built that way.

Nevertheless, when the man who wants your vote gives out with glowing promises about what he is going to do for you and your community (if you will only elect him), better take a second look. You are more than likely to be the consumer taxpayer who foots the bill. And when he promises to cut down waste and inefficiency in government,

when he promises to reduce your taxes, it is time to ask the gentleman a number of definitive questions.

HERE ARE SOME that come to mind. Perhaps they might serve as a yardstick to measure the man who wants *your* vote, whether he be Independent, Republican or Democrat.

1. Grants-in-aid by the Federal government to the States have risen from \$900 million in fiscal 1946 to approximately \$2.4 billion in fiscal 1954. * * * Will the candidate fight every measure which expands the shameful business of having the Federal government put the bite on local taxpayers, only to return to them their hard-earned tax dollars in so-called grants-in-aid, less a substantial percentage deducted for the Federal bureaucracy's handling charge?

2. According to the Postmaster General, as of July 1953 ". . . the Post Office Department is now running in the red at the rate of \$2 million every working day of the year. . . ." From 1933-53 the Canadian postal operations have shown a surplus in all but two years, while the U. S. Post Office has had a deficit during the same period except for the war years 1943-44-45. * * * Will the candidate vote for economies in postal operations and an increase in postage rates sufficient to put the Post Office on a self-supporting basis?

3. Forty states generally require a Constitutional amendment or a vote of the people to authorize debt beyond certain specified limits, except for repelling invasion. The average per capita debt for all of these states is less than \$50. In the 8 states where there are either no Constitutional restrictions, or minor ones, the average per capita debt is \$77.18; meanwhile the Federal government, where the debt limit is controlled only by a current Act of Congress, has piled up a crushing per capita debt of over \$1700. * * * Will the candidate go on record as unalterably opposed to the increase of our already astronomical national debt, except for the purpose of repelling invasion?

4. The Federal government operates over 100 business-type activities. It is the largest insurer, the largest lender, the largest ship owner, the largest warehouse operator, the largest grain owner, etc. etc. * * * Will the candidate support legislation to prevent the government from competing with private business?

5. As of June 30, 1955, the Federal government's "credit" programs will have outstanding approximately \$54.2 billion in loans, loan guarantees, etc. on everything from peanuts to pickle factories. * * * Will the candidate support legislation to get Uncle Sam out of this over-generous loan business?

6. Private business has, along with almost everyone else, had its fingers in the public pie. The major types of current Federal expenditures benefiting private business are: the postal deficit; maritime operating subsidies, navigation and other aids;

various aids to air navigation and air mail subsidies; losses accruing on defense production aids; uncollectible loans to large and small businesses, etc. * * * Will the candidate vote to reduce or eliminate subsidies to private business?

7. Congress has voted billions of dollars for the development of natural resources. Frightful waste has been involved in many of these projects. For example, in a project currently under consideration there is a "hidden" subsidy of around \$1 billion in the irrigation phase which amounts to \$2500 per acre where the average value of the land fully developed will be about \$150 per acre. * * * Will the candidate oppose such economic humbug, even when the project is within his own area?

8. As of May 31, 1954 more than 60% of veterans receiving free medical care in hospital beds were there for non-service connected disabilities. In addition, there were 21,505 veterans seeking (and cleared for) free hospitalization, all of whom were non-service connected cases. * * * Will the candidate join with others to prevent more raids on the Treasury of this special privilege type?

9. Activities of the Federal government have expanded fantastically during the past 25 years. Today there are Federal agencies in every county and city in America, plus 94 foreign countries and overseas regions. To support these activities there are 1400 budgeted projects and programs into which Federal funds are pumped through most of the 2,800 Treasury accounts. To administer this gruesome hodge-podge, there are 70 principal agencies with 2,117 component units. * * * Will the candidate work for legislation to cut down to size our gargantuan bureaucracy?

IF ANY GENTLE READER feels that the foregoing questions are too tough and that no candidates should be so put on the spot by his constituents, here are some grim examples of what is happening to the consumer taxpayer's dollars. They are furnished by the Tax Foundation:

When an Army general spends \$1,200 of the taxpayers' money to build a fancy kennel for his dogs, what does it really mean to the individual citizen? Sure, that's \$1,200 more needed in taxes, but such a small sum gets lost in the billion dollars the Federal government collects and spends every few days.

Nevertheless, those separate items of waste add up and, if you take a hard look, you can see what they mean for the individual American. For example, it would take a year's income taxes paid by three workers in a sporting goods factory to pay for the comfort of the general's dogs.

Investigation of construction costs for a Veterans' Administration hospital in Kansas City, Missouri, disclosed excessive architect-engineering and supervisory expense of about \$400,000. Excessive land costs totaled another \$26,000.

It would take a year's income taxes from 620 building construction workers to pay for this item of waste.

A United States Senator reported checking the U.S. air base building program in North Africa and finding an 80-mile fuel pipeline leading nowhere — and \$2 million worth of surplus lumber just baking in the noonday sun.

Some 4,854 workers in American sawmills, and planing mills would pay a year's income taxes to buy this hot lumber.

After World War II, the U.S. loaned \$329,000 to Alaskan Eskimos to provide better floors and ceilings for their igloos as a health measure. A recent check showed that some \$218,000 have not been paid back — with most of the loans in default.

A year's income taxes from 302 workers in special-trade contracting would just about equal this \$218,000.

In June, 1951, the Air Force bought 142 miles of nine-foot, chain-link fencing for \$1.5 million. Some two-thirds of it was still unused a year later. And 2½ years later, the date of the latest check, the Air Force was still scouting around trying to find some place to use the fence.

Cost of fence: equal to the income taxes paid on a year's work by 2,049 workers manufacturing fabricated wire products.

The Naval Air Station at Glenview, Illinois, spent \$13,140 each to remove five broken-down farm buildings from a proposed air strip. Then it requested \$10,000 each to make the buildings livable. The request was turned down because the buildings weren't worth the investment. The original moving job cost the taxpayer \$65,700.

That figure equals a year's income taxes paid by 182 workers in general construction contracting.

The Air Force leased storage space in Philadelphia for \$215,000 a year, and then never used it. The lease was finally cancelled but not until rental and maintenance had cost the government some \$251,000.

That quarter-million dollars is what 332 workers in plumbing and heating contracting pay on a year's income.

Speaking before a Government Economy Rally at Town Hall, New York City, May 25, 1954 the Honorable Herbert Hoover said: "Our Republic is beset by many dangers. But there is one we can control if we have the will to do so. That is, waste, unnecessary spending and unbalanced budgets. . . . That will power can be provided by the citizens of the country. . . ."

John Stuart is Chairman of the Board of Quaker Oats Company and former Chairman of the Illinois Committee for the Hoover Report.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Vol. XI, No. 39

Wednesday, September 29, 1954

Washington, D. C.

Censure Verdict: In the opinion of eminent Constitutional lawyers here, the real issue in the trial of Sen. McCarthy by a Senate Committee and its verdict that the Senate should censure him is the Constitution itself, and the integrity of Congress.

They point out that for twenty years, under the New Deal, the Constitution was systematically mutilated by the Courts and the Executive. This mutilation has continued — they point out — under the present Administration. Witness its perpetuation of Truman's gag rule on Federal employees appearing before congressional bodies and the creation of an Executive order of an essentially FEPC character, affecting government contracts, although Congress has refused to pass a FEPC law.

The whole trial and verdict of the Watkins group has been another deadly breach of the Constitution, in the view of legal scholars. To the Founding Fathers, a U.S. Senator was an Ambassador to the Federal Legislature; he was, with some minor limitations, responsible solely to his state. That state, through its representatives in Congress, might want to express a view or take an attitude unpopular to other states. But it should be the inalienable right of that state to have its say, no matter what the form of its expression. The Watkins Committee, without precedent in the history of the Legislature, has now laid down a new and totalitarian rule for the forced conformity of all states and their representatives in Washington.

The Committee declares that Senator McCarthy abused General Zwicker. McCarthy said that Zwicker was not fit to wear the uniform of a general after he (Zwicker) had given his opinion that a general who protects a "Fifth Amendment witness" in the service and orders his honorable discharge should nevertheless be retained in the service. This McCarthy view is unpopular with the current brood of commentators (although it is not evidently unpopular among the mass of people). But whatever the popularity or unpopularity of the McCarthy charge and its form of expression, never before in the history of Congress — says the veteran Washington correspondent, David Lawrence — has the "phrase in the Constitution [concerning 'misbehavior' of members] been construed to apply to language used by a member of Congress." With the ruling of the Watkins Committee, a method has been established to totalitarianize Congress and suppress "unpopular" viewpoints and actions.

Just the other day, Rep. Dawson assailed a witness as "a thief, an outlaw, a disgrace to the mother that bore you." Is he to be censured now? And there are many members of Congress who must be censured, if the rule is to be impartially applied. It may be George, or Byrd, or McClellan tomorrow. It is recalled that New Deal Justice Black in a *Harpers* article in 1936 (when he was an investigating Senator) approvingly explained why a committee examiner, in handling an evasive witness, has to "attempt to shake it out of him with a more drastic attack."

Hence, Constitutional lawyers here talk of the Watkins group verdict as a precedent for "collectivizing" the Legislature, reducing individual members to absolute control and conformity to the majority.

But the verdict holds a more sinister pattern. Senator Jenner remarked that it contained an omission which was "more significant than all the conclusions. This is the fact that the Communist world conspiracy is engaged in an unremitting attempt to destroy the political institutions of the United States, especially the congressional investigating committees and that the principal spokesmen for the Communist apparatus

have frankly put the discrediting of Senator McCarthy at the top of the program. . . . The attack on Senator McCarthy is not a personal attack. It is the front line of a continuing attack on the United States Congress which will end only in the destruction of the Communists or of the Congress." Proof of Jenner's assertion is the *Daily Worker* comment, the day after the Watkins' recommendation, on the censure of McCarthy. This voice of Moscow said: "Good news for America." Watkins gave the Kremlin what it wanted.

Not Merely Gossip: The new campaign manager of the Voters for Case organization in New Jersey is Mr. Clark Vogel, formerly of the TVA and of the Atomic Energy Commission. Vogel reportedly was the lawyer whom Henry Smyth (now resigned) of the AEC called in to abstract and brief the testimony on J. Robert Oppenheimer. Smyth supported the latter in the arguments within the Commission on whether Oppenheimer should be given clearance or not. Vogel worked in the TVA under David Lilienthal.

● A prominent Vermont member of the GOP informs us that some sort of ferment is evident in the Green Mountain state. He estimates that about three quarters of the people of the state are against Sen. Flanders in the latter's attacks on Sen. McCarthy. Our informant says that, while Vermont has been Republican since the Civil War, one cannot exclude the possibility of a Republican upset in the November election, either in the Governorship or Congressman races.

● Around the Press Club, it is related that the correspondent of a prominent Eastern metropolitan paper was ordered to ask the Watkins committee how that body's mail from constituents was going. The correspondent discovered that the proportion of letters was 35 to 1 in favor of Joe and so reported. His paper did not run the story.

● EDC is dead, we learn from a source in the French General Staff. Officers in that body believe that Premier Mendes-France will continue to stall and the French government will accept no feasible arrangement for German rearmament. This French source says Mendes-France has surrounded himself with fellow travellers who play Moscow's game. Our source calls the Premier the "French Kerensky."

● Higher-ups, Republicans, in the White House and State Department reportedly are bent on preventing the publication of the secret minutes of the fatal Yalta Agreement when Roosevelt and Alger Hiss sold out Europe and China to Russia. The obstruction continues despite frantic efforts by Senator Knowland and other congressional leaders to force release of the documents. When members of Congress granted the appropriation for the printing of the documents, they exacted a promise from the State Department that the papers would be published before the fall elections. In this case, it is less the State Department career men who are blocking the matter, than the appointive top level people.

Meeker Meek: Until recently, GOP Senatorial candidate Meek of Illinois was ahead of his Democratic opponent Douglas. Meek openly liked the Bricker Amendment and McCarthy, vocally disliked foreign aid and Communists. The crowd roared approval. But in the last fortnight, Meek has softened his tones, talks now more of the Ike program, less of his former popular topics. The new line is reportedly dictated by the big money-raisers who withhold badly needed funds from Meek unless he "toes the Ike line." Observers in Chicago say the GOP candidate has committed an error which may cost him the election. Meek's best chance, they say, is to hammer away for the Bricker Amendment, champion McCarthy and whale the daylight out of foreign aid and the Democratic coddling of Communists.

Potential Suicide: Although the left wing press hailed the Administration's proposal for an international "atomic bank," observers who closely followed UN actions regard it as "potential suicide" for the American people.

Ever since our discovery of the atom bomb, Communist and socialist internationalists have feverishly worked for the realization of two vital policies: (1) U.S. monopoly of the atom bomb must be broken. This

was accomplished through the theft of our atomic secrets by agents of the Kremlin with assists from Communist agents or pro-Soviet sympathizers in our government. (2) to lure us into a plan for international control of atomic energy which would ultimately leave us at the mercy of a "one-world" agency that would deprive us of our capacity for national defense. Lacking the military foundation for nationalism, the U.S. would become a department of a world government and would thereafter be exploited to the bone. As distinguished international lawyer as Dr. R. J. C. Dorsey of Washington frankly says that the Administration's proposed atomic bank, if established, would be a long and irrevocable step in this disastrous direction, and that with this formidable start the rest would be easy.

Dorsey points out that as far back as 1945 there was in the State Department an Acheson-Lilienthal plan for the international control of atomic energy. It was opposed by one brave official on the ground that we had the edge in atomic energy and atomic weapons and "should keep that advantage for ourselves, and not dish it out to people *'who might be our mortal enemies'!*" Then came the plan of financier Bernard Baruch which proposed absolute ownership of all fissionable material and complete control of its uses — both military and civilian — by a supra-national agency. In advocating adoption of the Bricker Amendment, Frank Holman, past President of the American Bar Association, cited the Baruch plan as an example of how, by a treaty, our national sovereignty could be completely undermined — through sapping our capacity for self-defense. The Baruch plan became impaled on the insurmountable difficulty of creating an effective inspection system for Russia.

Then the strategy of the one-world left-wingers shifted. An atom bank for peaceful uses of atomic energy was emphasized — the radicals knowing that if they could get that far they could go the rest of the route and include military uses. Apparently many loyal Americans tumbled for the new approach, masked as it was behind claims of fabulous benefits to humanity. For last December, President Eisenhower proposed that Russia join us and other nations in establishing just such a bank. At first, Russia balked (observers say this was simply clever strategy); but now Moscow is willing to have the whole matter put on the UN agenda for intricate behind-the-scenes maneuvers.

Ike's plan would make *the UN the real boss of the atom bank*. Its staff personnel would be selected by representatives of UN member nations and the bank would report *directly to the UN Security Council and Assembly*. Under this kind of setup the atom bank would be responsible for the inspection system to prevent any misuse of allocations of fissionable material by the receiving nations. Dr. Dorsey says we have already had enough experience with the UN to know that it could be counted on to betray our interests. He declared that placing an atomic bank under the UN would be "like pointing a gun at ourselves." For, there would be no assurance that the inspection system of the bank could prevent allocations of uranium to other nations from finding their way into Russia's war machine or even prevent Russia from finding a way to tap the bank directly and in secrecy. And Dorsey stresses still another grave risk. The bank would be created by international treaties and, in the absence of a Bricker Amendment to the Constitution, we would never know whether all had been disclosed to our Senate or whether some deadly provisions had been concealed by Executive agreement.

The Harriman Record: The record of Averell Harriman, gubernatorial candidate in New York, should be instructive for voters in the Empire State.

Two years ago Dr. Felix Wittmer, author of the *Yalta Betrayal* pointed out that "in the 1920's when our State Department opposed loans to Russia and refused to grant licenses for Russo-American trade, Harriman sank heavy chunks of money into a German-Russian Transportation Association to trade with the Soviet via Germany." "Seven years before we recognized the USSR" said Wittmer "Harriman obtained a magnesium concession inside the Soviet Union from his friend the Soviet government." He called Harriman "the friend of Acheson and Jessup, a business partner of the Kremlin who has probably talked to Stalin more than any non-Russian, non-Communist on earth."

Pegler says that, as our Lend-Lease Administrator in Russia during the war, Harriman "deliberately forced on a plainly hostile power which was building for a post-war industrial future in competition with the civilized West, enormous masses of equipment which could have nothing to do with her current military effort against the Nazis — and that there is abundant testimony on this in the memoirs of many of his colleagues in that fantastic orgy." As our Ambassador to Russia, Harriman was present at the Teheran and Yalta conferences and came back to America a defender of those sell-outs.

A Republican Governor Speaks: Republican Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah, in a speech given in San Francisco, California, on September 22 "called President Eisenhower a former member of the 'inner circle of the New Deal' and accused him of carrying forward a program that 'is just as evil under the Republican Party as it was under the Democrats' " — so reports the San Francisco *Examiner* on September 23.

Lee was elected Governor of Utah in 1948 on an economy platform; rigorously put through his economy program in his first four-year term, despite wails from spenders; and, to the astonishment of cynical politicians, was re-elected in 1952.

The Utah Governor in his San Francisco address, as reported by the *Examiner*, launched "a vigorous attack on Federal policies which, he said, had not changed from the days of the New Deal." He also, according to the San Francisco paper "strongly supported Sen. McCarthy" (thus differing sharply from Sen. Watkins of his state) and called for "an end to all foreign aid."

The news story goes on: "I can't conceive, the Republican Governor said, 'of the Democrats coming to Bracken Lee and making him their candidate for President. Then why did we have to go to the inner circle of the New Deal to get us a President? And why do we find ourselves with a Secretary of State who used to go up and down the land preaching against the President's power to make treaties but who, after election, says he's all for it? The reason is you can't trust anybody with too much power.'

"Governor Lee listed as 'blunders that have never been explained' the original recognition of Soviet Russia, war aid to the Russians, the post-war division of Germany. 'It's as though there was a planned move to destroy this country', he said, 'And we're still operating under the same foreign policy that created those blunders. An evil under a Democrat is still an evil under the Republican party'."

Twenty-Third Amendment: The American Progress Foundation, 1540 N. Highland Avenue, Los Angeles 28, California, has started a movement to "get the U.S. Government out of business" and backs the proposed amendment to the Constitution designed to prohibit the U.S. Government from engaging in competition with its citizens. Representative Ralph Gwinn launched the amendment project on January 13, 1953 with House Joint Resolution 123 and it is reported that more than 6,000 organizations have adopted resolutions supporting it. A number of national leaders figure on the Board of Directors of the foundation as follows: John U. Barr, New Orleans; Mary D. Cain, publisher of the *Summit Sun* of Mississippi; James H. Gipson, book publisher of Idaho; R. C. Hoiles, Publisher of the Freedom group of newspapers, California; Loren B. Stark, of Houston, Texas; Clif Stratton of the Capper publications, Topeka, Kansas, etc. Although the Eisenhower Administration has made some moves in the direction of disposing of government-owned plants, the pace is slow and much remains to be done. Washington observers watch to see if the movement for a "Twenty-Third Amendment" gathers momentum.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$5.50. One year, \$10. Two years, \$18. First class mail, one year, \$11.00; six months, \$6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, \$12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, \$11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.